

Appl. No

Amdt. Dated

Reply to Office action of

5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the specification, the term “ an electromagnetic coils” has been revised to “a set of electromagnetic coils”.

Claims 1-4 have been amended appropriately in order to overcome some informalities and grammatical defects.

10 The Examiner pointed out that claims 1-5 were rejected as being anticipated by Lu (US 2003-0116601A1), however, the applicant couldn't agree more on this, and the reasons are explained as follows:

15 In terms of objective: the objective of the present invention is to solve the problem of the conventional electric nailer that the conventional electric nailer can only work at specific points of time.

The objective of Lu is to enhance the impact force of an electric nailer.

Thus, the objective of the present invention is different from that of the cited reference.

20 In terms of spatial structure: the present invention comprises a power source 20, a set of electromagnetic coils 30, a control unit 40 and a moving member 50. The power source 20 is specified as DC current, and the control

unit 40 can control the power source 20 (the DC current) at a standard reference potential or predetermined potential.

Lu comprises: an alternating current power source 10, a protection circuit 20, a first switch 30, a full-wave doubler/full-wave rectifier 40, a 5 timing controller circuit 50, an energy-storage circuit 60, a solid-state switch circuit 70, an electromagnetic coil device 80, a DC power source 90, a second switch 100, a reset enable single shot trigger circuit 200, and a relay 300.

Thus, the spatial structure of the present invention is different from that of Lu. Not only the number of components of the present invention is less 10 than that of Lu, but also the power source is specified as DC current, and the control unit is used to control the power source at a standard reference potential or predetermined potential. Thereby, the present invention and Lu are incomparable since they are substantially different from each other.

In terms of functions: the power source of the present invention is DC 15 current, and the polarity and the value of the current and the voltage will not be changed with time, thus, the control unit is able to control the power source at a standard reference potential. In other words, the power source is maintained at the potential, thus, the electric nailer of the present invention is workable to eject the nail at any points of time.

20 Lu still uses the capacitor to store power and to discharge power to the electromagnetic coils in a short period of time, thus enhancing the impact force.

Although both the present invention and LU are able to eject nails, the electric nailer of the present invention can eject nails at any points of time. Nevertheless, Lu cannot do this.

Thereby, applicant believes that the present invention is patentable
5 over the cited reference of LU.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone
10 interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15

Respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley

Attorney of Record

20

USPTO Reg. 20, 149

90 John Street, Third Floor

New York, New York 10038
Tel: (212) 791-7200
Fax: (212) 791-7276